THE

Damning Nature of Rebellion:

OR, The Universal

[illegible] of Resistance

Under pain of Damnation, in the saddest sense;

ASSERTED IN A

SERMON

Preached in the Cathedral of *Norwich*, May 29. 1685.

BEING THE

ANNIVERSARY-DAY

Of the Birth of His Late MAJESTY

CHARLES II.

And of the Happy Restauration both of Him and of the Government from the *Great Rebellion*.

By *William Jegon*, late Fellow of *Kings-College* in *Cambridge*, and Rector of *Swanton Morley* in *Norfolk*.

LONDON:

Printed for *Will. Oliver*, Bookseller in *Norwich*, 1685.

Harvard College Library
In Memory of
Daniel de Jeune Howard
Class of 1916
July 12, 1932

Imprimatur.

Aug. 27. 1685

C. Alſton, R. P. D. Hen. Epiſc. Lond. a Sacris Domeſticis.

To the Right Worſhipful

FRANCIS GARDINER, Eſq;

MAYOR of the City of *Norwich*,

And one of His Majeſties Juſtices of the Peace for the County of *NORFOLK*.

WORTHY SIR,

THAT the Publication of this Diſcourſe is entirely owing to your earneſt ſollicitation, I can ſafely avow to the World, having by me ſufficient evidence of it, I mean your Letter, which, if it were allowable to produce it, would evince more than I appeal to it for, even that I could not without incurring the imputation of rudeneſs, or at leaſt affected modeſty, decline your requeſt; but I can further Appeal to you, and am ſecure of your atteſtation, that I conſented to it with this condition, that our worthy Dioceſans approbation ſhould be firſt obtained, which you readily undertook, and have it ſeems effected: And this is what I had to ſay concerning the Publication. As to the ſubſtance of the Diſcourſe I have little elſe to ſay but that I am ſure 'tis honeſt, and I have this convincing evidence of it, that you yourſelf approv'd it, whoſe invincible Loyalty is ſo well known, and known to be ſo well grounded.

Whether it may do that ſervice you conceive, whatever I wiſh, I am ſure I have too much cauſe to fear, when after ſo many excellent Diſcourſes Publiſh'd to the ſame purpoſe, to prove the abſolute Unlawfulneſs of Reſiſtance, and proving it

to all the purposes of Conviction, we find persons at this time of day the most notoriously guilty of it, that will not at their last dying moments be induced to own it or repent of it, which may serve for a confirming evidence of what I urge towards the conclusion of my Discourse, that this sin of Resistance is seldom at all, and seldomer truly repented of, and therefore the more to be dreaded as, if not certainly, yet too too probably exposing to Damnation in the saddest sense.

But if it may contribute in any the least measure to those Ends you may conceive, and wish it may, and, it seems, hope it will, those excellent Ends you yourself with so much zeal and constancy, with such unwearied diligence pursue, even the service of our Sovereign and the security of the Government, I shall think myself happy, and thankfully acknowledg it: But however the event be, which is uncertain, if you will please to interest yourself in it, by accepting this Discourse, whereof you occasioned the Publication, you will very certainly and sufficiently oblige,

SIR,

Swanson Morley,
Aug.10.1685.

Your most Humble Servant,

WILLIAM JEGON.

ROM.

ROM. XIII. 2.

They that reſiſt, ſhall receive to themſelves Damnation.

'Tis true, we have loſt, to the great and general grief of all good People, the principal ſubject of this days Anniverſary Solemnity, our Late Excellent Sovereign, who was this day wonderfully born, and this day more wonderfully reſtor'd, or rather (if I may ſo ſay) new-born to his People; we have loſt him indeed, and ſuch is our loſs, ſo very great and ſo juſtly deplorable, that I could almoſt be tempted to laments on this very day of publick feſtivity and rejoycing: And I preſume I might very excuſably give way to them, were it not that this loſs is ſo happily repair'd, as there may ſeem to have paſs'd rather an exchange than a loſs, and an exchange rather of Names than Perſons. The Tempers, the Vertue, and the very ſouls of the two Royal Brothers being ſo like, ſo undiſtinguiſhable, that we are ſcarce ſenſible even of a change, but think, or may think that both the Brothers live as formerly, and, as formerly, act with one ſoul ſtill.

But be it that we have loſt the main and principal ſubject of this days Annual Joy, yet have we not wholly loſt the ground of it; for this day is Sacred and Memorable, not only for the birth of our late Sovereign, but (as we all know) for his Reſtauration

too:

too: Nor his alone, but the whole Nations Happineſs and the Churches Honour, I had almoſt ſaid her very Being; for ſhe lay ſo long time buried in the duſt and rubbiſh of Anarchy and Confuſion, that ſhe ſeem'd almoſt forgotten, as though ſhe had never been; and therefore her Reſtauration might not improperly be ſtyl'd her Reſurrection. But however that be, and whatever the *Church* of *England* is for outward ſplendour and beauty of Holineſs, all is the effect of this days Mercy, which ought therefore to be ever ſacred and memorable with us, as 'tis order'd to be by publick Authority. And tho' indeed we have of late had too much cauſe, (ſuch was the will of Heaven) to mourn, yet ſtill this day is ſacred to feſtivity on the whole Nations account, but eſpecially on the Churches; and we ought to rejoyce accordingly, and humbly and heartily bleſs and praiſe Almighty God on her behalf, and devoutly and earneſtly pray for the continuance of that happineſs ſhe was this day reſtor'd to, that Peace may ſtill be within her Walls, and plenteouſneſs within her Palaces: And this is a Duty incumbent upon all her Children at all times, eſpecially now on this memorable day, and 'tis to be hoped we ſhall be all accordingly affected to the ſuiting both our hearts and offices to the Grand occaſion.

But then we may be allowed to remember, as well from what a wretched ſtate of miſery and confuſion, as to what a glorious ſtate of happineſs and peace we of this Church and Nation were by this days mercy advanc'd, and withal what Principles were ſet on foot, and what Practices made uſe of to bring us to that wretched ſtate, and accordingly to endea-

vour the refutation of thoſe, and, as far as in us lies, the prevention of theſe for the future.

And as to the Church which was moſt concerned in them, notwithſtanding what was hinted of her reſurrection this day by way of alluſion, 'tis to be conſider'd ſhe is not yet Triumphant (God knows) but too plainly Militant ſtill, and under Perſecution from the Tongues and Pens of perverſe men, her Adverſaries on either ſide of her; and both ſo conſtant in their malicious oppoſition to her, that ſhe ſeems indeed (as ſhe hath been repreſented) the very tranſcript of her Saviour ſuffering between two Malefactors, with this difference ſtill, that both revile her, and but one her Saviour.

For on the one hand ſhe is tax'd with plain Proteſtantiſm, or profeſſing the true reform'd Religion, on the other with pretended Popery: Her Enemies on that ſide brand her for Schiſmatical, on this for Antichriſtian: By thoſe ſhe is twitted with Novelty, by theſe with Antiquity as high up as the firſt working of the myſtery of Iniquity, whenſoever it was.

But the miſery is, and 'tis really pittyable, that all her proteſting, renouncing and abjuring Popery, will not ſuffice to clear her of it: Not all her Vindications and repeated Victories by her invincible Champions over all her Adverſaries of the *Roman Communion*, can either convince or ſatisfie, or at leaſt ſilence her domeſtick Oppoſers, but ſtill ſhe is exclaim'd againſt as Popiſh, plainly Popiſh in her Goverment, in her Liturgies, and in her Ceremonies: Yea, her Miniſters, how formidable ſoever, as Adverſaries to the *Church of Rome* or Bulwark to their own, and by the ingenuous of that Church reputed rather not

Catholick

Catholicks than *Hereticks*, as the reſt ſtyle them, are yet at home, by her *true Proteſtant ſticklers*, loudly repreſented as *Papiſts* in *Maſquerade*, if not plainly and openly *Popiſh*.

As for her *Doctrine*, it is, as Reform'd, wholly oppos'd to *Popery*, and therefore ſure by no means cenſurable as *Popiſh*: Well, I meddle not with other points of her *Doctrine* now, but I am very ſure it can never be thought either *Popiſh* or *Phanatical* in the point of Obedience to the *Higher Powers*, which is the ſubject of my Text: For this ſhe as clearly aſſerts, as firmly eſtabliſhes, and faithfully and conſtantly practiſed as ever was done in any of the pureſt and beſt Ages of *Chriſtianity*.

And to give ſome little hints of her oppoſition both to *Popery* and *Phanaticiſm* in this point: She does not derive her Sovereign's Authority either from the *Pope* immediately, or from the *People*: She does not ſubject him to a *Conclave* or a *Conſiſtory*, or a *High Court* of *Juſtice*: She does not allow him to be ſentenc'd and depos'd by a *General Council* or a *General Aſſembly*: To be cut off by a Knife, nor yet by an Axe: To be poſted out of the World by Powder in Barrels, or Powder and ſomewhat elſe in Blunderbuſſes: Nay, ſhe does not allow him to be ſo much as reſiſted upon any pretence whatſoever, *without danger of Damnation in the ſaddeſt ſenſe*.

I need not tell you at this time of day that there have been *Doctrines* currently vented, and practiſes ſet on foot exactly agreeing to them, but both as directly oppoſite to the *Doctrine* of our *Church*; yea, and of the whole *Church* of *Chriſt* too, for a thouſand years at leaſt, as any thing can poſſibly be: It may there-

fore

fore ſeem very ſeaſonable, upon ſuch an occaſional meeting as this, to enquire what the *Scripture* aſſerts in the Caſe, and ſee whether it does not fully authoriſe the *Doctrine* of our *Church*, and condemn the contrary: Accordingly I have choſen a *Text*, the cleareſt and ſevereſt againſt *Reſiſting*, of any in the whole *Bible*, *They that reſiſt, ſhall receive to themſelves Damnation.*

It has been obſerved from ſundry of the *Antients*, that in the Infancy of *Chriſtianity*, there was a rumour ſpread (which is ſuppos'd to have taken its riſe from *Judas* of *Galilee*, mention'd, *Act.* 5. 37.) that the *Goſpel* was deſign'd to undermine Kingdoms and Commonwealths; as if indeed the deſign of our *Saviours* firſt coming were the ſame with that which is reſerv'd for his ſecond, * *To put down all rule, and all authority, and power*: And that for this reaſon our *Saviour* himſelf, and his *Apoſtles*, did ſo frequently and ſo earneſtly inculcate the *Doctrine* of *Obedience* to the *Higher Powers*, that the *Religion* might not incur an odium.

* 1 Cor. 15. 24.

I ſay nothing now to the reaſon alledged, but that both our *Saviour* himſelf and his *Apoſtles* did actually inculcate ſo the ſaid *Doctrine*, is obvious to all that are never ſo little converſant in the *ſacred Writings*; and were there no other Inſtances to be produced thence, yet this place of St. *Paul*, from whence I have my Text, is ſo plain and pregnant, ſo full and comprehenſive, as there needs no more to inform and ſatisfie the conſciences of thoſe who are willing to know their Duty, and do not ſeek for cavil or ſubterfuge rather than ſatisfaction.

And ſo fully has this place been canvas'd and diſcuſs'd, the Point ſo amply debated, and the Caſe ſo clearly ſtated from hence, that there can be no pre-

tence of ignorance but what is more or leſs wilful, and let us take a curſory view of the context, which begins thus:

Let every ſoul be ſubject to the Higher Powers, that is, to the *ſupream Authority* of a *Nation* in whomſoever veſted, as is unanimouſly agreed on by all unprejudic'd men of ſenſe and learning, and clearly determin'd by the context following; the word ἐξουσίαις, *Powers*, being afterwards explained by οἱ ἄρχοντες, *Rulers*, Ver. 3. and Θεοῦ διάκονος, *the Miniſters of God*, Ver. 4. and ὑπερέχων being ordinarily us'd both by *Claſſic Authors*, and by St. *Peter* himſelf for ſupream, and ſo render'd by our *Tranſlators*, 1 Pet. 2. 13.

To theſe *Higher* or *Supream Powers*, the *Apoſtle* requires expreſly that *every ſoul be ſubject*: And here 'tis pertinently remark'd by *Origen*, that the *Apoſtle* has put his injunction in a term the moſt general and comprehenſive that could be, and yet particularly applicable to every individual, *let every ſoul be ſubject*, as obliging all that have but a common ſoul or ſpirit.

And our *Church Homilies* are very particular too, and no leſs pertinent in their remark upon this place. * *We ought diligently to obey St.* Paul, *that dear and choſen Apoſtle of Chriſt, even as we would obey our Saviour Chriſt himſelf if he were here preſent; and let us learn of him, that all perſons having ſouls* (*he excepteth none, nor exempteth none, neither Prieſt, Apoſtle, nor Prophet*, ſaith St. *Chryſoſtom* †) *do owe of bounden Duty, and even in conſcience, Obedience, Submiſſion and Subjection to the Higher Powers which be ſet in Authority by God: Foraſmuch as they be God's Lieutenants, God's Preſidents, God's Commiſſioners, God's Judges, ordained of God himſelf, of whom alone they have all their Power and all their Authority; and the ſame St.* Paul *threatneth no leſs*

pain

* Homily of Obedience, *pag.* 64. *Ed.* 1673.

† And he ſaith it indeed yet more particularly: And to the ſame purpoſe *Theodoret*, and long after both, St. *Bernard.*

pain than everlasting damnation to all disobedient Persons, to all resisters against this general and common Authority: For-asmuch as they resist not man but God, not man's device and invention, but God's Wisdom, God's Order, Power and Authority.

This is sufficiently plain, and this must be granted the standing sense of the *Church of England* touching this place of the *Apostle*, because these *Homilies*, and the *Doctrine* contained in them, are establish'd by publick *Authority*.

And the same in substance was the current sense of the whole *Church of Christ* in the *first* and *purest Ages* of it, and generally of the *Churches* of the *Reformation*.

But to proceed, the *Apostle* adds, as the ground or reason of this *universal subjection* to the *Higher Powers*, that *there is no Power but of God: The Powers that be* (or the Powers then in being, for so some understand αἱ ὔσαι ἐξουσίαι, and so *Nero*'s Power who was then regnant) *are ordained of God.* Can any thing possibly be more plain than this for the *Divine Institution* of *Sovereignty*? a thing so plain indeed, not only from this and sundry other places of *Holy Writ*, but from natural reason too, that one of the *Antients* affirms, they who have not read the *Scriptures* do think it (as very many Learned *Heathens* have declar'd they did) and they who have read them do know it. And in no one point of *Christian Doctrine* have the *Antient Sages* of our *Religion*, the *Primitive Fathers*, more unanimously agreed, as the Unlearned as well as the Learned know at this time of day: And all the *Churches* of the *Reformation* are clear for it, as appears from their *Confessions*. And for our own *Church*, yea, and *State* too, for I may safely joyn them together in this, they are as expres for it as the plainest words can shew them to be:

Orosius.

The *Common Lawyers* agreeing in it with the *Caſuiſts*, and the *Statutes* as plainly and fully aſſerting it as the *Canons*.

But if there were nothing elſe to prove it, yet the *Power* of the *Sword*, or the *Power* of *Life* and *Death*, which is an *eſſential branch* of *Sovereignty*, undeniably evinces it to be *originally* from *God*, who alone could give the ſaid *Power*; and I would fain ſee it prov'd, that the King-creating *People* ever had this *Power*: And if they never had it themſelves, how they could impart it is ſomewhat myſterious.

But notwithſtanding ſo general and unanimous a conſent both of *Churches* and *Perſons*, as well *Antient* as *Modern*, in a point ſo very plain from the *Apoſtle*, and in a manner ſelf-evident, great numbers in the *Church of Rome*, and the *Jeſuits* eſpecially, aſſert the contrary, and therein are followed by the *generality* of our *Seperatiſts*, *That all ſupream Power is originally and radically ſeated in the People, and that if Kings fail of their* Duty, *the People may ſupply it; at leaſt in ſome Caſes may do it of themſelves: That Kings are accountable to the People as their Superiors, and not only cenſurable and puniſhable, but as they are pleas'd to expreſs it*, Dethronable.

I ſhall not ſtand to diſpute the Point with them now, but bating the invincible evidence to the contrary of this from the *Power* of the *Sword*, wherewith *Sovereign Princes* are inveſted, I ſhall only put this *Query*, Whether more deference in point of credit and authority be due to St. *Paul*, and the moſt eminent *Divines* of the *Church* of *Chriſt* in all *Ages*, and theſe back'd with the concurrent ſenſe of all ſober *Heathens*, or to the *Romiſh* and *Proteſtant Jeſuits* in this point, and without more ado I ſhall leave it to you

I have hitherto insisted upon the *Context*, and shewn how it has been (as St. *Peter* signifi'd of old, concerning some other passages of our *Apostle*) wrested by (the *unlearned* and *unstable* shall I say? yea, rather by) the *malitious* and *seditious* to their own *destruction*, eternal, 'tis to be fear'd; and how justly to be fear'd, will appear by enquirng into the *Words* I have chosen for my *Text*, which are as plain and express against *resisting*, as the *Context* for obeying the *Higher Powers*, *They that resist, shall receive to themselves Damnation.*

Which *Words*, as they stand in our *Translation*, are plain indeed, but as they are in the *Original*, they are more liable to *cavil* and *exception*, and then 'tis not to be expected they should escape it, when there have been, in sundry *Ages*, so many whose *Interest* it was to make it, in order to the success (I mean) of their *wicked Attempts.*

To the *Term* of *resisting* there is not much exception made, for tho' it may sometimes signifie no more than to act contrary to the *Command* of the *Higher Powers*, yet it cannot bear that signification in my *Text*, because the *Higher Powers* may possibly command that which we are oblig'd, by a *Power Superiour* to theirs, to act contrary to, as if they *Command* any thing repugnant to the express *Word* of *God*, then as St. *Peter* has determin'd the case, and as 'tis *universally* agreed on, we ought to *obey God*, and not *Man*; not any *Human Power* whatsoever, but to act contrary to their *Command*: And that, for certain, is not to incur *Damnation in the saddest sense*, of which the word, ἀντιτασσόμενος here is confessedly capable. But to *resist* (as the very *Words* used by the *Apostle* here plainly import) is to use *hostile violence*, or *forcibly* to withstand, and that is to incur *Dam-*

nation

nation, according to our rendring the word Κρῖμα, which the *Apoſtle* uſes in the *Text*; but whether the word does really import here *Damnation in the ſaddeſt ſenſe*, that is, *eternal Condemnation* from *God*, or only ſome *Temporal Mulct* or *Puniſhment* from the *Magiſtrate*, *Whether it be unto Death, or to Baniſhment, or to Confiſcation of Goods, or to Impriſonment*, hath been, and ſtill is, made a Queſtion: And truly I have not ſeen any determination of it ſo clear, as it ſeems to me capable of. A learned man, of the late times, hath told us indeed, *That the Analogy of the place will ſufficiently evince the Point, that this word,* Κρῖμα, *is like a ſword with two edges, fitted not only to kill the Body, but to deſtroy the Soul alſo; that it threatens puniſhment from the Magiſtrate, is very true, but not all: Ye muſt needs be ſubject, not only for Wrath, but alſo for Conſcience ſake. You are exhorted not to Rebel, becauſe you may be Hang'd: But leſt confidence in Numbers ſhould anſwer this Objection, a ſtronger motive is us'd, You ſhall certainly be Damn'd. It is probable you may take the Gallows in your way, but, however, Hell will be the end: Yea, though you eſcape a ſhameful Death, yet you have forfeited eternal Life.*

Author *Anonymus.*

It may be ſo, as this *Author* ſays, and indeed it is too probable, but he has not clearly evinced it.

Some have gone further, and ſaid much more, but I conceive not all that might be ſaid upon it: And of late, in *popular Diſcourſes*, it has been rather taken for granted, than deſignedly proved. I humbly offer, therefore, the reſult of my *Meditations* upon the *Point*, and upon the *Text*, and I ſhall do it in this method.

1. I ſhall endeavour to prove, that Κρῖμα, in this place, does really ſignifie *Damnation in the ſaddeſt ſenſe*, that is, *eternal Condemnation* from *God*, tho' not excluding the other more *gentle ſenſe* of *Temporal Puniſhment* from the *Magiſtrate*.

2. I

2. I ſhall ſhew that there is nothing to take off the *force* of this *intermination*, no juſt caſe of *exception* againſt the rule of my *Text*, no *pretence* allowable; but for *Subjects* to *reſiſt*, I mean, forcibly to *reſiſt* their *Lawful Sovereign*, is *abſolutely* and *univerſally* to incur *Damnation*, and nothing to *atone* for the *Crime*, in the ſight of *God*, or to prevent the *Puniſhment* threatned here, but *Repentance*. And this is all I can think neceſſary to inſiſt upon from the *Words*, ſaving only ſome little matter by way of *Application*.

I begin with the firſt, that Κρῖμα, in this place, does realy ſignifie *Damnation in the ſaddeſt ſenſe*.

Now, 'tis granted, the *Word* does ſignifie, in *Scripture*, ſometimes *Human Judgment*, ſometimes *Capital Puniſhment*, or the *Sentence* of *Death* inflicted upon *Malefactors*: But then it muſt be granted too, that, in many more places of *Scripture*, it ſignifies *Divine* and *Eternal Puniſhment*, or *Damnation in the ſaddeſt ſenſe*: And that not only where it is joyned with other words, that plainly point and direct to that *ſenſe*, but where it ſtands by it ſelf alone, without any additional *note* or *point* of *direction*: And this hath been ſhewed at large by learned men, * and ſo need not be ſtood upon now.

* Particularly Dr. *Hammond*, *in loc. & alibi.* and Dr. *Falkener*, Chriſtian Loyalty. Part 2.

But this being taken for granted, that more generally the *Scripture* uſes the *Word* for *Damnation in the ſaddeſt ſenſe*, the only queſtion is, *Whether ſo here in my Text, or no?* I do not ſay *excluding*, but *implying* the *other ſenſe* too of *Temporal Puniſhment* from the *Magiſtrate*.

There is, indeed, another remarkable place where the *Word* is uſed, but in what *ſenſe*, is alike queſtion'd; and that is, 1 *Cor.* 11. 29. where it is applied to *Unworthy Communicants*: *He that eateth and drinketh unwor-*

thily, eateth and drinketh Κρῖμα, we read, *Damnation to himſelf*: But whatever the *real ſenſe* of Κρῖμα be there, it has been very pertinently obſerv'd, that in the *late unhappy times*, when the queſtion was moſt ſtifly canvaſs'd about the *ſenſe* of my *Text*, moſt of thoſe who were hotteſt for the *gentler ſenſe* in the place of my *Text*, as making for their *Intereſt* who were *actually* in *Arms* againſt their *Sovereign*, and little fear'd any *Temporal Puniſhment*, were as hot for the *ſadder ſenſe* of the ſame *Word* in that other place to the *Corinthians*: And the reſult was, that effectual care was taken men ſhould not incur *Damnation* for *Communicating unworthily*, by keeping them from *Communicating* at all, for ſeveral years together.

But then, that men might not be as much deterr'd from *reſiſting*, or *taking* up *Arms* againſt the *King*, or *continuing* in them, by any *fear* or *apprehenſion* of Κρῖμα, ſignifying *Damnation* indeed in this place of my *Text*; it was eagerly contended for the *gentler ſenſe* to be affix'd to this place, that Κρῖμα here ſhould ſignifie only ſome *Temporal Puniſhment*, which the *King* might *inflict*, if he happened to *Conquer* his *Rebels* up in *Arms* againſt him: And if it ſhould come to that once, then men were to look to themſelves, and ſcape as well as they could.

* Againſt the King.

Then *reſiſting*, or *taking* up *Arms*, * would be plain down-right *Rebellion*, and of a moſt *horrid nature*, but not 'till then, according to *Cromwel*'s *Doctrine*, who, in the midſt of the *late War*, declar'd, (it ſeems) *That if he and his Party prevail'd, their oppoſers would be accounted the grandeſt Traytors, to the State, that ever were: But if the King ſhould prevail, their undertaking would be judged the moſt horrid and black Rebellion that ever the Sun beheld.*

Then

Then have a care of *Attainders* and *Executions*, of *Gibbets* or *Axes*, *Confiscations* or *Imprisonments*; but no beware of *Damnation* all this while: No, that was no part of their *care* or *fear*, and, indeed, *Why should it?* If *taking* up *Arms* against their *Sovereign*, were neither *threatned*, nor like to be *attended* with any worse *consequence*, than only some *Temporal Mulct* or *Punishment*, which were certain to be avoided by *Conquest*, if that were the *issue*: Or, if the worst should happen, it were more than possible to be avoided by *flight* or *concealment*, or perhaps by the *clemency* of the *Conqueror*, or at least the number of *Resisters* would secure the far greatest part from the utmost *severities*.

And when there was so many *starting holes*, so many, (*possible*, shall I say? nay,) *probable* ways of *escaping* this Κρῖμα of the *Apostle*, in *their sense* of it, who would needs have it import only some *Temporal Punishment* from the *Magistrate*, Why should they fear *resisting* or *taking* up *Arms*, or *continuing* in them, and not rather go on to *fight manfully the Lords Battels, and help him against the mighty*; when they were so far from incurring *Damnation* for it, that they were plainly *accursed* if they did not, as they were *frequently* and *roundly* told from that * place of the *Prophet*, wretchedly mis-applied: *Cursed is he that doth the work of the Lord deceitfully*, or negligently, *and cursed is he that keepeth back his sword from blood?*

* Jer. 48 10.

But, to recollect myself, though what has been now said cannot savour much of digression, because the *Tenets* and *Practises* specifi'd, are plain natural results from the premises laid down: For if to *resist* be not to incur *Damnation in the saddest sense*, but *barely* and *simply* some *Temporal Mulct* or *Punishment* from the *Magistrate*, and that too not *certain*, not *inevitable*, and far from that, What should hinder *resisting* at any time upon a *prospect* of *Conquest*, or at least a *considerable advantage*?

But, God be thanked, the case is not altogether so clear for them, for 'tis certainly possible, that Κρῖμα, in this place, may signifie *Damnation in the saddest sense*, as it does confessedly in sundry other places of *Holy Writ*; and, if it were only so, *Resisters* cannot be altogether *secure*.

But not to rest here, I shall forthwith betake me to the clearing my first *Proposition*, that Κρῖμα, in this place of my *Text*, does really signifie *Damnation in the saddest sense*: And this I shall shew,

1. From the *Context* or the *Analogy* of the place.
2. From the *current sense* of the most approved *Expositors*; and,
3. From parallel places of *Holy-Writ*, which represent *Resisting* as a *Crime* of a most *gross horrid Nature*, and *consequently, damning in the sight God.*

1. I shall shew it from the *Context* or the *Analogy* of the place.

And here, 1. *Let every soul be subject to the Higher Powers*, is plainly the *Precept* establish'd upon this *Penalty*, whatever it be that Κρῖμα imports; and we are pretty well agreed about the *Notion* of the *Higher Powers*: However, I have prov'd already that it *signifies* the *supream Authority* of a *Nation*, in whomsoever vested. That we be *subject* to this *Authority*, is an *Apostolical Precept*; and our *Blessed Saviour* has expresly given the same *Authority* to his *Apostles Doctrine*, as to his *own* delivered by *himself*, and commanded them to be received with the same deference of *belief* and *submission*, as what they deliver in point of *Doctrine* or *Precept* as *himself*: *He that receiveth you, receiveth me, and he that receiveth me, receiveth him that sent me*, St. Matt. 10. 40. And, as it was intimated before, as the *sense* of the *Church* of *England*, we ought to obey St. *Paul*, even as we would obey *Christ* himself: And sure, from

what

what has been ſaid, 'tis plain we ought. Whatever then the *Apoſtles* deliver, as the *Doctrine* of *Chriſt*, is *Goſpel* as much as any thing *Recorded* by the four *Evangeliſts*: And the *Apoſtle* is very plain for this, *That all who obey not the Goſpel of our Lord Jeſus Chriſt, ſhall be puniſh'd with everlaſting deſtruction*, 2 Theſſ. 1. 8, 9. *Subjection* to the *Higher Powers* is here expreſly injoyned by the *Apoſtle*, and conſequently is a *Goſpel Precept*: And notwithſtanding Mr. *Baxter*'s nicety of a *Reſiſtance* not contrary to *ſubjection*, certainly all *forcible Reſiſtance*, which is plainly the *Apoſtles* meaning here, is ſufficiently contrary to *ſubjection*. Now, whether to *reſiſt* the *Higher Powers*, and conſequently to *diſobey* the *Goſpel*, be not to incur *everlaſting Deſtruction*, or *Damnation in the ſaddeſt ſenſe*, I leave to be conſider'd.

Again, 2. All *Power*, and by a neceſſary conſequence the *Higher Powers*, are of *Divine Inſtitution*: This is expreſly aſſerted by the *Apoſtle* here, *There is no Power but of God*: *the Powers that be, are ordained of God*: And thence he infers, *That whoſoever reſiſteth the Power, reſiſteth the Ordinance of God*. Now, whether to *reſiſt* a *plain Ordinance* of *God*, an *inſtitution founded* and *eſtabliſhed* by *Divine Authority*, if we will take the *Apoſtles* word for it, be not to offer contempt to the *ſacred Authority* of *God* himſelf, and ſo to incur his *final diſpleaſure*, and conſequently *Damnation in the ſaddeſt ſenſe*, without *Repentance*, I leave again to be conſider'd.

2. The *Apoſtle* adds here, *Verſ.* 5. of this *Chap. Ye muſt be ſubject, not only for wrath, but alſo for conſcience-ſake*: Here by *wrath*, all the World underſtands *Temporal Puniſhment*: And, as Dr. *Hammond* hereupon urges, if that were all that is meant by Κρῖμα in the *Text*, it could not be true, much leſs concluded thence, *that men muſt be ſubject, not*

only for wrath; but if we muſt needs be *ſubject*, and by, at leaſt, an *equal neceſſity*, not *reſiſt*, *not only for wrath*, or for fear of *Temporal Puniſhment*, then he that does *actually reſiſt*, ſhall *receive* or *incur* more than a *Temporal Puniſhment*, even all the *conſequence* of a *wounded*, *grieved conſcience*, which, when it *accuſes*, binds over to *eternal wrath*, or *Damnation in the ſaddeſt ſenſe*, without *repentance*, as no man doubts, that *pretends* any *acquaintance* with the *Chriſtian Doctrine*. If therefore we will allow the *Apoſtle* to ſpeak *ſenſe* here, we muſt grant there lies on us, from theſe *words*, a neceſſity of *ſubjection*, and conſequently of not *reſiſting* for ſome *higher* and *further reaſon*, than only a *fear* of *temporal puniſhment*; and what that can be other than *eternal*, or *Damnation in the ſaddeſt ſenſe*, I leave again to be conſider'd.

But here it is urged bo way of *Objection*, and that from the *Context* too, that κρίμα, in this place, muſt ſignifie only ſome *Temporal Puniſhment* from the *Higher Powers*, becauſe it follows immediately, *Rulers* are not a terror to *good Works*, but to the *evil*.

By the way, their *Objection* plainly implies, that to *reſiſt* is an *evil Work*, or elſe it were not *puniſhable* by the *Magiſtrate*; and as ſuch it is, as all other *evil Works* are, not only a *ground* of *Temporal Puniſhment*, but expoſes Men to *Eternal*, without *Repentance*.

But to anſwer directly to the *Objection*; 1. It is not deny'd, but *Reſiſtance* is a matter which the *Magiſtrate* is concern'd to *puniſh*; and they that *actually reſiſt* him, may ſecure themſelves: he will *puniſh* them for it, if it be in his *power*, and he be not ſome way *appeas'd*, or otherwiſe *prevented*. But who can perſuade himſelf, that the *Bleſſed Apoſtle*, by the *Spirit* of *God* directing him, ſhould threaten ſo great a *Crime* as *Reſiſting*, which is no better than *Rebellion*, *and that is as the ſin of witchcraft*, with an award

which

which is common to it, with the *meaneſt offences* in the *World?* nay, that the *Great* and *Learned Apoſtle* ſhould argue againſt *reſiſting* from ſo poor a *Topick*, as fear of *Temporal Puniſhment* only, ſeems to me ſo *jejune* and *flat*, as is infinitely below his *Character*, as the great *Doctor* of the *Gentiles*: He needed not his Education at the feet of *Gamaliel*, much leſs his *Infallibility* as an *Apoſtle* to dictate this, for certainly *Nokes* or a *Styles*, a *Cade* or a *Kett*, or any of the *Rabble* of *Reſiſters*, need not be told that they incur a *Temporal Puniſhment* from the *Magiſtrate*, if they be *ſubdued* and *taken* in the *Act* of *Reſiſting*, or *deprehended* in the *Attempt* or *Deſign* of it. But if they happen to *ſubdue* or *awe* the *Magiſtrate*, or ſome way or other to *eſcape*, as 'tis odds but they may, at leaſt the more inconſiderable among them, What ſignifies the *intermination* of the *Magiſtrates Anger*, and the *conſequence* of it, ſome *Temporal Puniſhment*, to *deter* them from *reſiſting?*

2. Again, If fear of *Temporal Puniſhment* were the ſum of the *Apoſtles Argument* in this place, Why ſhould he particularly apply it to the inſtance of *reſiſting?* the *ſupream Magiſtrate* might be ſaid indeed not to *bear* the *ſword* altogether in *vain*, if he did *bear* it only againſt *Treaſon*, *Rebellion*, and ſuch like *violations* of *Majeſty*, as immediately concern his own *Perſon*: But certainly he could not be ſaid to *bear* it to any great purpoſes of *advantage* to the *Commonwealth*, or *Community* of his *Subjects*, if he did not *bear* it againſt other *Criminals* and *Malefactors* as well as againſt *Reſiſters* or *Traytors*, and if equally againſt all, Why the *Apoſtle* ſhould alledg the *fear* or *danger* of it againſt *Reſiſters* only? if that were all he meant, I am very much to ſeek; and therefore, methinks, for the honour of the *Apoſtle*, *Chriſtians* ſhould not preſume to *father* ſo *trifling* an *Argument* upon him, as that if any *reſiſt* the

the *Higher Powers*, they ſhall receive a *Temporal Puniſhment*: If we underſtand the *merit* here, and not the *event*, that *reſiſters* deſerve a *Temporal Puniſhment*, 'tis very true indeed, but to no great purpoſe of *deterring* them: If the *event*, it will not always hold, for certain, it will not in the caſe of a *proſperous Rebellion*, or *flight*, or *concealment*, or ſome other way of *avoidance*.

And now to ſum up what has been ſaid upon this firſt *Argument* taken from the *Context*; Seeing, 1. It is an *Apoſtolical*, and *conſequently* a *Goſpel Precept*, *That we be ſubject to the Higher Powers*; and to *reſiſt* them, in the *plain ſenſe* of my *Text*, muſt be *granted* not to be *ſubject*, and not to be *ſubject*, is not to *obey* the *Goſpel*, and not to *obey* the *Goſpel*, is, to incur *everlaſting Deſtruction*, without *Repentance*.

Seeing in the ſecond place, that to *reſiſt* the *Higher Powers* is evidently to *reſiſt* the *Ordinance of God*, and that is to offer *contempt* to the *ſacred Authority* of *God* himſelf, and that can be no leſs than to incur his *final diſpleaſure*, and conſequently, *Damnation in the ſaddeſt ſenſe*, without *Repentance* ſtill.

3. Seeing we muſt needs be *ſubject*, and, by *conſequence*, not *reſiſt*, *not only for wrath*, or for *fear* of *Temporal Puniſhment*, it muſt be for ſome *other reaſon*, or on ſome *further account*, and that is, plainly, for *fear* of *wounding* our *Conſciences*, which will certainly expoſe us to the *wrath eternal*, without *Repentance*.

4. And laſtly, Seeing it were exceedingly below the *Apoſtle* to argue againſt *Reſiſting*, from ſo poor a *Topick*, as *fear* of *Temporal Puniſhment* only, which all the *World* knows will certainly attend the *Crime* of *Reſiſting*, if not ſome way or other *prevented*, and which might as well be urged againſt any other inſtance of *offending* the *Laws*. I ſhall not make my own *reference*, but leave it as before

to

to be *conſider'd*, whether the *Apoſtle* can *reaſonably* be ſuppos'd to intend by the word Κρῖμα, in this place, any thing leſs that *eternal* Damnation, without *Repentance*, as the *puniſhment* of *Reſiſting*.

And ſo I proceed to my ſecond *medium*, by which I *propoſed* to prove this, and that is the *current ſenſe* of the moſt approved *Expoſitors*.

And here I might *urge* what I find *aſſerted* to my *hand*, that not one *Writer* for a *thouſand years*, of any *credit* in the *Church*, did ever *doubt* or *queſtion* the *Doctrine* of *Obedience* to the *Higher Powers*, as 'tis *maintained* by the *Church of England*, or the *unlawfulneſs* of *reſiſting* them, upon any *pretence* whatever: And why? but becauſe the *Holy Scripture* ſo *frequently*, and *particularly* St. *Paul*, here in this *Chapter* has ſo plainly *ſtated* it, made it ſo *clear* and *manifeſt*, and ſo *formidably* threatned the *oppugners* of it. And for the *practice* of the *Primitive Chriſtians* in all parts of the *Word* (which is *incomparably* the beſt *Comment* upon the *Scriptures* of the *New Teſtament*) 'tis very certain they were univerſally *ſubject* to their *Governors*, *in omnibus licitis*, and never *reſiſted* them, whatever *ground* or *pretence* they might have for it; and this, indeed, is almoſt as *univerſally* acknowledg'd that they did not *actually reſiſt*: Their *Reaſons* we ſhall after enquire into. But take we this by the way, in St. *Auſtin*'s words; *Their Demeanour was perpetually and invincibly Loyal towards their Temporal Governors, without any the leaſt Reſiſtance*, propter Dominum eternum, *for fear of offending their great and eternal Sovereign, the Lord of Heaven and Earth, and thereby incurring his final diſpleaſure, the effects whereof are intolerable and eternal, and altogether unavoidable, but only by Repentance.*

But to be more *particular*, with *reference* to the *Argument* in hand.

Among

Among the *Antients*, St. *Chryſoſtom*, and thoſe who follow'd by way of *expounding* the *Scriptures* neareſt the *Letter*, for the reſt, almoſt all before him, were moſtly given to *Allegorical Expoſitions*: St. *Chryſoſtom*, I ſay, and his followers, as *Theophylact* and *Oecumenius*, I may add *Photius* too, for ſo much as remains of his *Comments*, are generally accounted the beſt *Commentators*. St. *Chryſoſtom* (ſays a * Learned Man of our own *Church*) had ſo *happy* a *Talent* in *expounding* the *Scripture*, in the moſt *obvious* and *litteral ſenſe*, that, as an *Antient Writer* aſſures us, his *judgment* herein was accounted the *common ſtandard* of the *Church*, and out-weigh'd the *Expoſitions* of all the other *Fathers*: Now he and his *followers*, with one conſent, declare *plainly*, if not *expreſly* too, for the *ſadder ſenſe* of Κρῖμα in this place. St. *Chryſoſtom's* δίκη σφοδρὰ μαλίστα ἢ τιμωρία, no *light*, but very *ſevere vengeance*, and that from *God*, who is σφοδρὸς τιμωρὸς τῶν καταφρονουμένων τότε, a *ſevere avenger* of all ſuch as *contemn* theſe *Higher Powers*, and thereby, μειζόνως παροξύνουσι Θεὸν, exceedingly *provoke God*, is ſufficiently clear for my *purpoſe*; and ſo *Theophylact*, ὃ ἀνθεστηκὼς παρὰ Θεῷ τιμωρηθήσεται, he that *reſiſts* ſhall be *puniſh'd* by *God* himſelf: And to the ſame purpoſe, *Photius* in *Oecumenius* (whom I may therefore cite as one) expreſly interprets the word Κρῖμα here, by Κατάκρισις παρὰ Θεῦ, *Condemnation* from *God*. I deny not but all theſe, how much ſoever they are for the *ſadder ſenſe* of Κρῖμα here, do withal include the other *ſenſe* too of *Temporal Puniſhment* from the *Magiſtrate*; which I know none that *offers* to *exclude*, though I think it not very *neceſſary* to be *urgent* for it, or lay any *great ſtreſs* upon it, becauſe ſo likely to follow in all caſes of *Reſiſting* that are *improſperous*, and do not *prevail* upon the *Legal eſtabliſh'd Authority*.

Dr. *Cave* his Life St. *Chryſtom*.

But be it that the *Apoſtle* implied, in the word Κρῖμα here,

a *Temporal Puniſhment* from the *Magiſtrate*, ſo it be *granted*, as 'tis by theſe *Antients* expreſly, that he *meant* by it, and that *chiefly* too, *eternal* Damnation from *God*.

And with theſe of the *Greek Church*, agree St. *Ambroſe* and St. *Auſtin* for the *Latin*. St. *Ambroſe* upon thoſe words, *Ye muſt needs be ſubject, not only for wrath*, id eſt, ultionem preſentem; *that is*, ſays he, *for fear of preſent or temporal vengeance*, ſed & propter futurum judicium, *but alſo for fear of the judgment to come*, quia ſi hic evaſcerint, illic eos pœna expectat ubi ipſa accuſante conſcientia punientur: *For however*, ſays he, *they eſcape here, yet there their own conſcience will be their accuſer, and God himſelf their avenger.*

And St. *Auſtin* ſays, * concerning *Reſiſters*, *that beſides what they may ſuffer from men*, apud Deum ſortem non habebunt, *they ſhall have no part with God*; and elſewhere he reckons it very clear and manifeſt: *Patet* (ſays he) *mortale peccatum eſſe poteſtati civili reſiſtere*, 'tis evident, that to *reſiſt* the *Civil Power* is a *Mortal Sin*: And by *Mortal*, we know he means a *Sin* of a *damning nature*, that fearfully expoſes to the *wrath* and *indignation* of *Almighty God*.

* Ep. 1

And with theſe conſents St. *Bernard* too, though living in an *Age* when the *Papal Power* had not a little encroach'd upon the *Imperial*, but much corrupted the *Chriſtian Doctrine* in *point* of *Obedience* to the *Higher Power*: Yet he, even in that *Age*, aſſerted it *damnable in the ſaddeſt ſenſe* to *reſiſt*, and that from this place of the *Apoſtle* in my *Text* †.

† Ep. 1 & 221. *Ludovic Regem.*

And to come down to thoſe of the *Reformation*, the *generality* of them are *clear*, if not for the *ſadder ſenſe* of Κρῖμα here, yet, which is all one, for the *damning nature of Reſiſtance*; even *Paræus*, who has been *cenſur'd* for ſome *unadviſed expreſſions* in the *Caſe*, is very *clear* and *right* with others in his *Comment* upon my *Text*, not only affiring

that Κρῖμα here may be taken in either *ſenſe*, of *Temporal* or *Eternal Puniſhment*: But that however *Reſiſters* may eſcape the hands of *Men*, yet, *Certe a Deo*, from *God* they are ſure of a *ſevere award.*

And to Contract, the moſt *eminent Divines* of the *Reformation*, though they meddle not with the word Κρῖμα in my *Text*, yet they agree in the *ſubſtance* of it, *generally* aſſerting it *damnable* to *reſiſt*; and none, or very few of thoſe that call themſelves *Proteſtant Divines*, are *Diſſenters* in this, but only thoſe of the *Kirk of Scotland*, and their *Brethren* here, the *Presbyterians* and *Phanaticks*.

As for the *ſenſe* of the *Church of England*, and all her *Divines*, or *true* and *regular Sons*, as well as *Fathers* in the caſe, 'tis ſo *plain* and *clear*, and ſo very well known that, it were an *inexcuſable impertinence* to inſiſt *particularly* upon it at this time of day.

And now being compaſſed with ſo great a Cloud of *Witneſſes*, having ſuch a *concurrent ſtream* of *Expoſitors* and others on my ſide, I hope I may venture to *aſſert*, from the *importance* of the word Κρῖμα in my *Text*, that it is a *ſin* of a *damning nature* to *reſiſt* the *Higher Powers.*

But I ſhall add to the *Confirmation* of it, from my third propoſed *Topick*, and that is, from *parallel* places of *Holy Writ*, which repreſent *reſiſting* as a *Crime* of a moſt *horrid nature*, or at leaſt a very great *ſin* againſt *God*, and *conſequently* of a *damning nature.*

I inſtance, 1. In that very *remarkable expreſſion* of *Moſes* to *Korah* and his *Company*, when they *aſſociated* themſelves together againſt him, and were not far from *taking up Arms*, but certainly ſo far *reſiſted* him, as openly to *oppoſe* his *Authority*, as an *encroachment* upon them. *Ye are gathered together*, ſays he to *Korah* the Ring-leader, *thou and all thy Company are gathered together againſt the Lord*, Numb. 16. 11. They

They were not ſo *ſenſeleſs* as to gather together *intentionally* againſt the *Lord*; no, but they were gathered together againſt *Moſes*, their *ſupream Civil Governor* appointed ſo by God, againſt *Aaron* the *chief* in the *Eccleſiaſtical Adminiſtration*: And this *Moſes* calls their *gathering together againſt the Lord.* And, as Arch-Biſhop *Uſher* obſerves, even *Women* did ſee plainly that in oppoſing *Moſes* and *Aaron* in ſuch a manner, they oppoſed *God* himſelf, the *ordainer* of their *Authority*, for ſo the Daughters of *Zelophehad*, Numb. 27. 3.

But for a full *Confirmation* of it, *God* himſelf atteſted it in ſuch a manner, as *ſufficiently* ſhew'd his *extream indignation* againſt it, and *conſign'd*, to all *ſucceeding Ages*, his *utter abhorrence* and *deteſtation* of *Reſiſting*, as a *Crime* of a moſt *highly dreadful*, and conſequently *damning nature*; and certainly, (as one obſerves) that ſome have *ſmarted* for it *eternally*, is for ever enough to *convince* us, that *God* is *highly diſpeaſed* with every one that thruſts *himſelf* into the *guilt* of it. But of theſe firſt *Reſiſters*, the *Text* tells us, *That they went down alive into the Pit*, according to our *Tranſlation*; but the *Margin* reads into *Hell*, which *Optatus* * * underſtands literally, *Tartareo carcere ſubito clauſi*: For certain to ſuch as follow their ſteps, St. *Jude* ſaith, *Is reſerved the blackneſs of darkneſs for ever*, St. *Jude* 13. and St. *Peter* ſays the ſame, 2 *Pet.* 2. 17.

* *Contra Parmen.*

2. But a ſecond *Inſtance* is that of *Samuel*, who telling the *People* that had been *importunate* with him for a *King* to be ſet over them, after the manner of their *Neighbouring Nations*, when indeed they were under a *Theocracy*, *God* himſelf being *immediately* their *King*: *Samuel*, I ſay, telling them the manner of a *King*, in ſuch *Inſtances* as ſome will have to favour of an *Arbitrary Power*, tho' others reckon them only the *neceſſary burdens* and *charges* of Go-

vernment. However that be, the *Prophet* adds, that when they had once *ſubjected* themſelves to that *Power*, and felt themſelves *aggrieved* by it, they ſhould cry out in that day, becauſe of their *King* they had choſen them, and the *Lord* would not *hear* them in that *day*; it ſeems they ſhould have nothing left them, even in caſe of *real grievance*, but recourſe to *God*, and that would prove, in their caſe, *ineffectual* too, *God* would not hear them. But how if they ſhould take upon them to *redreſs* their *grievances* themſelves, by *reſiſting* and *taking up Arms* againſt their *King*? Why! it would only be *directly* and *daringly* to *intrench* upon God's *Prerogative* of *Vengeance*: But of that I leave you to *conceive* the *iſſue.*

3. But we have yet a *plainer inſtance* of the *criminal nature* of *Reſiſting.* 1 Sam. 26, where *David* having *opportunity*, which alone is oftentimes *incentive* enough in ſuch *caſes*, and *abſolute Power* to have deſtroy'd the *King* his *Enemy*, when 'tis certain he could as eaſily have taken away *Saul*'s *Life* as his *Spear*, and we may ſuppoſe him *prompted* to it by two *powerful motives*, *Intereſt* and *Revenge.* And whatever there might be of *guilt* in it, *Abiſhai* offer'd to take that upon himſelf by *perpetrating* the *fact*, and laying *violent hands* upon *Saul*: Yet *David* would by no means ſuffer it, but urged this remarkable *Query* againſt it; *Who can ſtretch forth his hand againſt the Lord's Anointed and be guiltleſs?* But before whom ſhould *David* have been *guilty?* Or to whom *accountable*, if he had *conſented?* for he was (as I may ſay) *Heir apparent* to the *Crown* by *Divine Deſignation*: And was not the *King* his *implacable Enemy*, that had *perſecuted* him with the *utmoſt* of *malice* and *virulency*, againſt *Law* and againſt *Reaſon?* and had not God (as *Abiſhai* urged to him) delivered his *Enemy* into his hand, by caſting all his *Army* into a *deep ſleep?*

and

and had *cut them off*, and the *King* with *them*, Who ſhould have called *David* to an *account* for it?

Why truly nothing of all this was in the leaſt to be feared in the *Caſe*: And yet *David* was *infinitely afraid* of *ſtretching forth his hand againſt the Lords Anointed*, or ſuffering another to do it, becauſe of the *guilt* attending it in the *ſight* of *God*.

No! As the *ſenſe* of the *Church of England* is in her *Homilies*, concerning this very *inſtance*, *David* durſt not for fear of *offending God* and his *own Conſcience* (tho' he had *occaſion* and *opportunity* for it) once lay his hand upon God's *High Officer*, * whom he did know to be a Perſon *reſerved* and *kept* for his *Office-ſake* only to God's *Puniſhment* and *Judgment*. And from this *inſtance* of *David*'s invincible *Loyalty*, ſo *clear* and *manifeſt*, ſo abundantly *evident* (one would think) beyond *contradiction*, the *Homily* aforeſaid infers, that it is an intolerable *ignorance*, *madneſs* and *wickedneſs*, for *Subjects* to make any *Murmuring*, *Rebellion*, *Reſiſtance*, or *Withſtanding*, *Commotion* or *Inſurrection* againſt their moſt *Dear* and moſt *Dread Sovereign Lord* and *King*, ordained of God's *Goodneſs* for their *Commodity*, *Peace* and *Quietneſs*.

Homily of Obedience Part. II.

* The King.

And if we may judg of the *Criminal nature* of *Reſiſting*, by God's *ſevere proceedings* againſt the *Authors* of it, What can we think, but that it is infinitely *odious* in his *ſight*?

When the *firſt* and *moſt* remarkable *inſtance* of it he *puniſhed* by an aſtoniſhing *Miracle*, the Earth *opening* and *ſwallowing* up all the *Reſiſters*: And tho' 'tis true, nothing of this did ever happen *again*, yet that it did ſo *once*, is enough to aſſure us of God's *eternal deteſtation* of the *Crime*.

And in the next remarkable *inſtance*, I mean that of *Abſalom*, ſo ſtrangely infatuating the *Counſels* of the moſt

politick,

politick, and ſo *amazingly* bringing the miſerable *Ring-leader* to his end, by making the *Hair* of his *Head* inſtrumental to his *ruin*, and cutting him off thus in the very *act* of his *Crime*, notwithſtanding all the *care* his *Royal Father* took to *prevent* it: Sure if we *reflect* ſeriouſly upon God's *ſevere diſpleaſure*, ſo ſignally *evinced* by ſuch *aſtoniſhing inſtances* of it, we cannot, with any *ſhadow* of *reaſon*, imagine that *Reſiſting* ſhould be ſo *light* and *trivial* a matter, as ſome would fain have it from their *fancied importance* of the word κρῖμα in my *Text*.

And now, I would fain perſuade my ſelf, I have made it ſeem very *probable*, at leaſt, that κρῖμα in this place of my *Text*, does really ſignifie *Damnation in the ſaddeſt ſenſe*, by what I have urged, 1. From the *Context*, which I am ſure very *ſtrongly inclines* to it, if I muſt not ſay *abſolutely clears* it. From the *concurrent ſenſe* of the moſt *approved Expoſitors*, as well *Antient* as *Modern*: And, 3. From *parallel places* of *Holy Writ*, which very *plainly* ſhew, that *Reſiſting* is a *ſin* exceedingly *diſpleaſing*, or rather *deteſtable* in the *ſight* of *God*, and *conſequently*, I may ſay, of a *damning nature*. I am ſure our *Church* is very *clear* for the *damning nature* of it, declaring in expreſs terms, *that eternal Damnation is prepared for all impenitent Rebels in Hell with Satan, the firſt founder of Rebellion, and grand Captain of all Rebels*: And 'tis plain, that all *Reſiſters* with *Her* are *Rebels*. And the firſt *Council* that ever made any *Canons* againſt *Reſiſting*, was the fourth *Council* of *Toledo* in *Spain*, Anno 633. for there never was any occaſion for the *Churches proviſion* againſt *it* before that, ſay ſome: For certain there was not, for the firſt three hundred and forty years, if not much longer. But that *Council* is very *ſevere* againſt the *Authors* and *Abettors* of the *Crime*, not only *Excommunicating* and *Anathematizing* them, but *ad-*

omily a-
ainſt Re-
ellion,
ag. 379.

judging

judging them to be *damned* in God's *future Judgment*, and to have their part with *Judas Iſcariot* : And this *Sentence* was confirmed in the Fifth *Council* that followed there, and the ſame was done in the *Council* of *Calcuth.*

But after all, ſuppoſing it could not be made ſo *clear* as it may ſeem to be, that κρῖμα ſignifies in this place of my *Text*, *eternal Damnation*, without *Repentance*, yet what *aſſurance* can be given to any *Chriſtian*, that makes the leaſt *doubt* or *ſcruple* whether it does not, when it cannot be deny'd but the word is *capable* of that *ſenſe* ?

I cannot *conceive* any other way of *ſatisfying* the *doubt*, or *ſilencing* the *ſcruple*, but one of theſe *two* ; either a plain *Demonſtration*, or a new *Revelation* to the contrary.

As for the *former* of theſe, the matter is not *capable* of it : For who can pretend to *Demonſtrate*, or (to uſe a term of greater *Latitude*) undeniably *convince* any man living, that the *Apoſtle* in this place, and by this word, did not mean *Damnation in the ſaddeſt ſenſe* ?

And for the other way of a new *Revelation*, however the *Perſon* pretending to it may *ſatisfie* himſelf, he cannot another, of the *truth* of his *Revelation* without a *Miracle*, or ſomewhat equivalent to *atteſt* it : And without that, what *ſecurity* can he give that he does not *incur* that *Anathema* of the *Apoſtle*, againſt *Angel* or *Man* that ſhould *Preach* another *Goſpel*, or the contrary to that he had *Preached* ? Gal. 1. 8, 9.

And without ſuch *Conviction*, as either that of *Demonſtration*, or a new *Revelation* ſufficiently *atteſted*, what infinite *hazard* is it for a *Chriſtian* to venture upon the *guilt* of *Reſiſting*, which, 'tis more than *poſſible*, for *certain* may be attended with *Damnation in the ſaddeſt ſenſe* ? I am pretty ſure there is no abſolute *ſecurity* againſt it, in caſe of actual *Reſiſting*, but *Repentance* only : And that muſt be

be granted infinitely *hazardous* in a *War*, eſpecially if the *War* be ſinful.

And for a *Perſon* to be taken away ſuddenly by *death*, in the very *act* of *Reſiſting*, as 'tis *poſſible*, yea, *probable*; nay, let me add, 'tis very great odds but he may, if *engaged* in it, and at his firſt appearance before the grand *Tribunal*, hear the *Holy Spirit*, or his *Amanuenſis* St. *Paul*, avouch, that by Κρίμα, in this place, was truly meant *Damnation in the ſaddeſt ſenſe*, is infinitely *aſtoniſhing*, and much too *dreadful* in *Theory*, ever to be *hazarded* in *Practice* by rational *Chriſtians*, that does indeed *believe*, and has any tolerable *apprehenſion* of *Damnation*.

Well! but ſuppoſing the worſt, Is there nothing to take off the *force* of this *intermination*? No lawful *ground* of *reſiſting* the *Higher Powers*?

No, not any, as I come to ſhew, according to my ſecond *Propoſal*; namely, that there is no juſt caſe of *exception* againſt the *rule* of my *Text*, no pretence *allowable*: But for *Subjects* to *reſiſt*, I mean, *forcibly* to *reſiſt* their *Lawful Sovereign*, is *abſolutely* and *univerſally* to incur *Damnation*, and nothing to *atone* for the *crime* in the *ſight* of *God*, or to prevent the *Puniſhment* threatned here, but *Repentance*.

I confeſs this *aſſertion* cannot but ſeem a little *ſtrange*, when there have been ſo many caſes of *exception* made againſt this *general Rule*, ſo many *pretences* ſet on *foot*, and reckon'd *allowable*, ſo many *ſtarting holes* found out.

But I am ſure I have very good *Authority* for what I ſay, our *Laws* and *Statutes* as well as *Canons*, and the declared *Doctrine* of our *Church* being clear on my ſide: And this methinks ſhould ſeem, in all *reaſon*, abundantly *ſufficient* to any profeſſed *Member* of our *Church*, who muſt neceſſarily *renounce* ſuch his *Membership*, and ceaſe

to

to be of the *Church of England*, before he can allow himself the liberty of *reſiſting*.

As for our Laws, that of the 25 of *Edw.* 3. and thoſe of the 13 & 14 of *Charles* the ſecond, declare it univerſally unlawful to make or levy any war againſt the King, without the allowance of any caſe or pretence whatſoever; and the ſame is expreſly required to be acknowledged by all the Clergy in the *Act of Uniformity*; and the ſame in ſubſtance is required of all Civil and Military Officers.

Our Canons declare expreſly againſt all taking up of Arms, whether offenſive or defenſive, without the Royal Authority, much more againſt it, upon any pretence whatſoever, under pain of *Damnation*, for which they cite the words of my Text, as very plain in their ſenſe.* *The firſt of the *Canons* of 1640.

Our Homilies teach us, God hath ſhewn that he alloweth neither the Dignity of any Perſon, nor the Multitude of any People, nor the Weight of any Cauſe, as ſufficient for the which Subjects may move Rebellion againſt their Princes.* *Homily againſt *Rebellion*, p. 568.

It were endleſs to cite particular Writers of our Church to this purpoſe; but by what has been ſaid, ſo clear is the Doctrine of our Church in the point, as ſome have made this remark upon it, That ſince the Reformation it is now again current *Epiſcopal Doctrine*, as it was always *Apoſtolical*, *That Subjects ought by no means to reſiſt, nor can be diſobliged from their Obedience to their Sovereigns, upon any pretence whatſoever.*

It being then ſo clearly the Doctrine of the Church of *England*, and that confirm'd or back'd by the Civil Sanction, and ſo the avowed ſenſe of all the Authority of the Nation; is it not prodigiouſly ſtrange to hear it excepted againſt, not only by *Engliſh*-men, but, what is much more, by pretended Members of the Church of *England*, as we have had, ſome few years paſt, ſufficient evidence?

Well! but does the Church of *England* agree in the point with the Church of Chriſt in the primitive and pureſt ages of it? or with other Churches of the Reformation?

That it does perfectly agree with the primitive Church in the point, has been ſo frequently, ſo plainly, and ſo convincingly proved, that the Oppugners of it have been forced to have recourſe either to downright Slandering and Lying, or elſe to Enthuſiaſm.

To the firſt, affirming, contrary to the faith of antient and approved Hiſtories, and all accounts of thoſe times, that the Doctrine of *Non-reſiſtance* then generally maintain'd, and the practice of Chriſtians

exactly ſuited thereto, was grounded upon nothing elſe but weakneſs, or want of ſtrength: they did not reſiſt *quia deerant vires*, as *Bellarmine* leads the Dance, and 'tis incredible how he is followed.

But in anſwer to it, 1. *admitting*, but by no means *granting*, that want of ſtrength or forces was one ground of their conſtant Loyalty, without the leaſt attempt of reſiſting; yet what an abominable ſlander is it to ſay, (which yet is ſaid) that it was the *only ground* of it, when their Apologiſts and other eminent Writers, lay down unalterable reaſons why they *would not*, *did not*, *durſt not reſiſt*, even becauſe they thought themſelves obliged to ſuffer any thing from the Government, rather than reſiſt, by the moſt ſacred and indiſpenſable Laws of their Religion, as hath been very often, and of late abundantly made appear. Want of ſtrength then was not the *only ground* of their not reſiſting, as ſome have ſhamefully ſlander'd them: And no wonder, when others have not ſtuck to ſpeak as ſlanderouſly of the Apoſtles themſelves, as if their end in preſcribing Subjection and Obedience at firſt, were only to flatter the Emperours, and curry favour with them, as *Salmeron* had the impudence to affirm.

But, 2. that want of ſtrength or forces was any ground or reaſon at all of their not reſiſting, is ſo far from truth, that there never was a more ſilly groundleſs falſity invented, as hath been invincibly made appear to the meaneſt capacities, and therefore I ſhall the leſs need to inſiſt upon it. But I beg leave to urge two things with reference to it: The one is an inſtance not ſo commonly taken notice of, and that is this; In the Reign of *Adrian* the *Jews* almoſt univerſally, but eſpecially about *Egypt* and *Cyrene*, rebell'd againſt the Emperour, and appeared in Arms under *Barchochebas* their Leader, to the number of ſome hundred thouſands; and much about the ſame time, as may be gather'd from *Euſebius*, there was a Perſecution on foot againſt the Chriſtians, which might have prompted them to joyn with thoſe *Jewiſh* Rebels; and that they might have joyned with them if they would, is too certain, when they were uſed with at leaſt as much cruelty and ſavageneſs by the Rebels, meerly becauſe they would not joyn with them, as ever they had been by any of their Perſecutors, and yet they could never be drawn, by arts or arguments, by perſuaſion or force, to aſſociate with the Rebels. And this inſtance ſeems to me ſo plain and home to the purpoſe, that I ſhall only make this remark upon it, That thoſe of the Church of *England* in the late Times were not the firſt Martyrs or Confeſſors purely for Loyalty, theſe primitive Chriſtians being their Precedents, and leading them the way.

The

The other thing I have to urge in the caſe, is this; *Bellarmine* and his followers, in very great numbers affirm, That the primitive Chriſtians wanted ſtrength or forces to reſiſt: but *Tertullian*, who lived in thoſe times, ſays, *They filled all places but the Temples, and were of all the ſtanding Offices almoſt in the whole Empire.* And St. *Cyprian*, not long after him, affirms, *That they were vaſtly numerous and copious*; that is, as the word ſeems to import, they were of the Militia or Souldiery too. And 'tis undeniably evident, that almoſt all *Julian*'s Army when he died were Chriſtians, as the Eccleſiaſtical Hiſtorians all with one mouth aſſert. Now, whether you will believe *Tertullian* and St. *Cyprian*, and ſo many antient Hiſtorians, or *Bellarmine* and his followers, is left to your choice.

But the prettieſt that has been ſaid upon this caſe of reſiſtance, and St. *Paul*'s Doctrine about it, is this, that *Paul* intended his Doctrine of Non-reſiſtance purely with reſpect to the men he wrote to, of that Age 'tis meant, and no otherwiſe than as if a man ſhould write to the Chriſtians at preſent under the *Turks* Dominion, confeſſedly poor, and unable indeed to reſiſt him; would he not write as *Paul* did? No queſtion but this learned Author fully knew the Apoſtle's mind: nay, and had conſulted him perſonally upon the point, when he ſo confidently adds, *That if* Paul *were alive, and ſaw wicked Kings reigning in Chriſtian Commonwealths, he would leave them to their Subjects to be puniſhed by them without blame.* Whither are we rapt now? into the third Heavens, there to conſult *Paul*? But I told you recourſe was to be had of neceſſity either to downright ſlandering and lying, or elſe to Enthuſiaſm; and here ſeems to be ſomewhat of both.

But this was the familiar mode of the late Times to pretend Revelation: So *John Goodwin*; *Now that Antichriſt is apparently come to his full Power and Authority, that which was not known before, but kept conceal'd from the Churches of Chriſt, is fully manifeſt, that Chriſtians may lawfully, in a lawful way,* (that is when they may lawfully) *ſtand up to defend themſelves, in caſe they be able, againſt any unlawful aſſaults, by what aſſailants, or by what pretended Authority ſoever, made upon them.* And another, *The lawfulneſs of Rebellion is now diſcovered to God's Church as the neceſſary means to ruin Antichriſt*: So *Burroughs* cants after *Goodwin*. But a more blunt Enthuſiaſt has told us roundly, *That it was God's will the primitive Chriſtians ſhould confirm the truth by ſufferings, but now that it is confirm'd, his will is that we ſhould defend the truth by action, in deſtroying Tyrants.* Boldly ſaid indeed, and methinks this Gentleman ſeems more intimately acquainted with God himſelf,

than the former was with St. *Paul*, as knowing God's ſecret will, for we know of nothing he has revealed but the contrary to this as his will in the caſe.

But to leave Enthuſiaſts as paſt conviction, and to have as little regard to thoſe others who have the impudence to oppoſe a known certain truth, as clear as any thing of that nature can poſſibly be, with meer ſhams, I ſay the Doctrine of the Primitive Church is plain and manifeſt againſt all Reſiſting upon any pretence whatſoever, ſo plain and clear, that as was before obſerv'd, not one writer for a thouſand years of any Credit in the Church did ever queſtion it; And *Sigebert* reckon'd the contrary doctrine a novelty at leaſt, if not a plain Hereſie, and juſtly imputes the original of it to Pope *Hildebrand*, as not crept into the World before him.

As for the Churches of the Reformation, they are no leſs plain and clear againſt all reſiſting, as any man may ſatisfie himſelf from their general confeſſions, and from the writings of particular members of them: I ſhall only urge the Authority of *Eraſmus*, who though he liv'd and dy'd in the Communion of the Church of *Rome*, yet was for a Reformation, and according to ſome the occaſion of it; and I the rather inſiſt upon his Authority, becauſe his Comments are recommended by our own Reformers, and ordered to be had in all our Churches: Now he in his Comment upon St. *Luke* 22. affirms, there is no Hereſie more pernitious than this of the lawfulneſs of reſiſting: the Precepts of Chriſt decrying it, his whole life being oppoſite to it, the Apoſtolical Doctrine teſtifying againſt it, it being rejected alſo by ſo many thouſand Martyrs, and contradicted by the Antient Interpreters: I may add, by all impartial writers of the Reformation.

And this ſure cannot but ſeem abundantly ſufficient to all unprejudic'd minds, that ſincerely deſire to know the truth, and are willing to be convinced of it.

Let me have leave to add this, as which makes very much for my Aſſertion of the abſolute unlawfulneſs of reſiſting, that the Caſes of Exception are ſo very wild and extravagant: and but two of them are worth taking notice of. As for the Additional ones of *Grotius*, 'tis ſaid, he was young when he made them, and 'tis plain he was to ſerve an argument, having his Country-men to defend.

As for that of Religion, which ſome inſiſt on, as not only a reaſonable, but the very beſt ground of reſiſting, 'tis the moſt ſenſeleſs impoſition upon the common reaſon of mankind that can well be imagin'd, to pretend it: for who knows not that our Religion can never

be

be loſt or taken from us by all the Powers of Earth and Hell combin'd together againſt us, without our own conſent. But what do I talk of Religion in the Caſe? that's commonly no more than the ſurface or ſhell; 'tis Ambition, or Intereſt, or Revenge is the Kernel or Subſtance, for without ſuch mixtures, Religion (as a Learned Gentleman obſerves*) works no violent effects, but produces rather examples of conſtant ſuffering than of deſperate actions. To pretend Religion therefore as a ground of reſiſting, is only to make appear our hypocriſie: which *Harry Martin* honeſtly diſclaim'd when he cry'd out in the houſe againſt ſnivelling for Religion, as the ground of reſiſting the King: *We have fought* (ſays he) *all this while for Liberty, and are we now whining about Religion*? And one *Colonel Purefoy*, like another *Peribonius*, was much more ingenious, declaring plainly after the King was beheaded, *that it was no more than what he had deſir'd, and deſigned to contribute to, forty years before.*

* Sir *William Temple*, p. 57.

But ſtill, as I ſaid, there are two caſes of exception inſiſted on, as of ſome validity. 1. If a Prince ſhall undertake to alienate his Kingdom, or ſell it, or give it up into the hands of another Sovereign, againſt the mind of his Subjects. A very pritty ſuppoſition, but only that it is ſo very unreaſonable, as not to be ſuppoſed by all the rules of commom prudence or charity: beſides, that it may be always pretended, if once ſuffered to paſs, and where are we then? Why then we are at the old paſs of undermining the *Thames*: that is of having any the moſt ridiculous and incredible ſtories obtruded upon us, and we muſt believe them for the good of the Common-wealth, which otherwiſe would be in mighty danger. Well! but there is another caſe of exception, rather more unreaſonable than the former, and yet, at the leaſt, as likely to be always pretended, and that is: If a Prince ſhall undertake to deſtroy his whole Kingdom, or any conſiderable part of it.

The former of theſe, beſides, that it very reverendly ſuppoſes the Prince either a fool or a madman, is little better than non-ſenſe, and next to impoſſible at leaſt. But the latter, that a Prince ſhould deſtroy a conſiderable part of his Subjects, was plainly the caſe of the Primitive Chriſtians, who were certainly both for number and quality, but eſpecially, for number, a very conſiderable part of the *Roman* Empire, *pars major Civitatis cujuſq;* (ſaith *Tertullian*) the greater part of every City: and according to *Grotius*, *metuenda plane multitudo* in plain Engliſh formidable for their numbers:

yet

yet they were not only deſign'd to utter deſtruction, but actually deſtroy'd in vaſt infinite numbers, by the expreſs order of their ſeveral Emperours, and that with the utmoſt cruelty and ſavageneſs, contrary to all the rules of nature, reaſon, and humanity. And yet, ſtill among theſe, *qui ipſorum ſævitiæ arma opponeret inventus eſt nemo* (ſays *Grotius*) and it has been ſufficiently ſhewed already: not one was found that wou'd oppoſe their Cruelty by force of Arms. Not one? Yes, ſays *Blondel*, I have found two inſtances to the contrary. And the truth is, he has two inſtances, but they are both wondrous odd: As that of a company of drunken Villagers, very probably Pagans too, reſcuing *Dionyſius* Biſhop of *Alexandria* from the hands of his Proſecutors, who were but private Souldiers neither: and the *Armenians* reſiſting *Maximin* who was not their Sovereign. Which only ſhew the good mans earneſt deſire to have them pertinent, whether they will be ſo or no.

But after all, there are Scripture inſtances produced to the contrary of this Aſſertion, that it is abſolutely unlawful to reſiſt.

And 'tis true, there are Scripture inſtances alledged, but no otherwiſe than as Texts of Scripture are by ſome quoted, only to make a flouriſh withall, and fill up a margin, or to ſeem proofs, though hardly the ſhadow of them.

And as for theſe inſtances out of Scripture, they have been conſidered, and ſufficiently prov'd to be either impertinent as ſome, or extraordinary as others, or laſtly wicked, and ſo not to be brought into example. And they do but only ſhew how hard the Oppugners of this Doctrine are put to it, when they can produce no better for their purpoſe.

And now to come home to our ſelves, and very briefly to apply what has been ſaid. The charge here againſt Reſiſting is Univerſal, and there is no limitation of it in the whole Scripture, none in the old Teſtament, much leſs in the new, and leaſt of all in this Chapter where the rule is laid: and beſides, the context or the Analogy of the place, the conſent of ſundry, the moſt eminent and learned expoſitours both antient and modern, and the practice of the beſt Chriſtians in all ages have been ſhewn very clear for the abſolute unlawfulneſs of reſiſting upon what pretence ſoever under pain of *Damnation*. And ſure, if to reſiſt the higher powers be (as the Apoſtle aſſerts in general) to reſiſt the Ordinance of God, it is *eo nomine*, in that reſpect alone ſo far from lawful in any caſe, or upon any pretence whatſoever, that it is infallibly always a ſin of a moſt provoking nature,

and

and as such it is here threatned, as far as I can possibly conceive or understand with *Damnation* in the saddest sense. And let me say *Damnation* is not to be trifled with, nor the Apostle's fearful threat here eluded by slights and pretences; but be these what they will, if upon them we resist, we must cease to be Christians, cease to be of the Church of *England*, and cease to be in a saveable condition, unless a very great and solemn Repentance intervene.

But for that, besides, that it is always infinitely hazardous in case of resisting, such is the criminal nature of resisting, that the Scripture compares it to Witchcraft, and indeed it too nearly resembles the sin of Witchcraft in this respect, (not that it admits not of Repentance, for I will not say so of its parallel, but) that it is seldom at all, and seldomer truly repented of; and for this I shall seek no further than our own age and memory: with what a wild Enthusiasm did the Usurper *Cromwel* go to his own place? What an opinion had he of his Saintship to the very last? as if he were one of those that needed no Repentance. When his end apparently drew near, he wou'd not be perswaded of it, but still fancied to himself that God had some further work in reserve for him. And his Brethren in iniquity and bloud, the Regicides that were executed, with what height of Fanaticism went they out of the World? how far from the least shew of Repentance? And oh blessed God! how few publick Recantations have we seen, notwithstanding so very many were engaged in the *Great Rebellion*?

But they were, they were the Saints; and as such I leave them, to bespeak your utter abhorrence and detestation of a Crime, which by what has been said may reasonably be concluded, or at least justly feared, to be of a most horrid nature, exposing to *Damnation* in the saddest sense. And let us consider the fearful issues of *Damnation*, and the infinite uncertainty of Repentance, which alone can prevent them in case of resisting. And as we would not lose our part with God, our share in the Joys and Glories of Jesus, our habitation in the Heavens with Angels and Saints in unspeakable happiness to eternal ages, which is the first sad part of *Damnation*. And then for the other, as we would not be given up to the insupportable amazements of a sad Eternity, and dwell with a Worm that dieth not, in a Fire that is not quenched, amidst Devils and damned Spirits for ever; let us beware of resisting the Higher Powers, which is a crime that exposes to all this, and more. But let us heartily bless Almighty God that we had no share in the great Rebellion, no

hand

(Band in the *Thirtieth* [illegible] do be to Extol [illegible]
down [illegible] full flow
And for [illegible] flourishing, [illegible] morable, [illegible] to hope it will [illegible] vereign, whom God long preserve. I say, for the mercy of this Sovereign, whom God long preserve. I say, for the mercy of this Sovereign, whom God long preserve. I say, for the mercy of this Sov